

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-15 were pending. In the present response, Applicant have amended claims 1, 6, 8, 9, and 11, and cancelled claim 7, leaving claims 1-6 and 8-15 pending in the present application for the Examiner's consideration. No new matter has been added.

In summary of the Office Action of November 16, 2004, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kelem (U.S. Patent No. 5,422,833). Applicant respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 as anticipated by Kelem. Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

wherein the allowable set of parameter values includes at least one common parameter value from the respective functional representations of at least two of the plurality of components.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference does not disclose or suggest at least this claim element.

Kelem discloses a method for "entering the data type on one or more of each of the circuit module interface ports and buses [and] propagating the data type from a circuit node where it is entered by a designer to all other appropriate points in the circuit design." (Kelem, Col. 2, lines 43-48). According to Kelem, "as an important feature of the present invention, the designer need not provide information on data type and precision for every bus and component in the logic design, because . . . the data type and bus width provided by the designer at perhaps one or a few places in the logic design are propagated to other points in the logic design." (Kelem, Col. 5, lines 43-50) (Emphasis Added). Thus, Kelem discloses initially setting data type and bus width values at one or

a few places in the logic design and then automatically propagating these values to the other parts of the logic design with unspecified values.

In contrast, claim 1 calls for "automatically defining an allowable set of such parameter values" that includes "at least one common parameter value from the respective functional representations of at least two of the plurality of components." Unlike Kelem, claim 1 does not call for propagating a parameter value specified at one place in the logic design to another place of the logic design with an unspecified value. Rather, claim 1 calls for determining a common parameter value between at least two different components of the logic design. Thus, Kelem does not disclose this element of claim 1.

Because Kelem does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 1, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5 are patentable over Kelem.

## II. Rejection of Claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 6-8 as anticipated by Kelem. Claim 6, as amended, recites in part:

representation includes at least one parameter value for the component, wherein the parameter value relates to data transfer protocol operation associated with the component.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference does not disclose or suggest at least this claim element.

Kelem discloses the use of a bus to connect the interface ports of circuit modules. Kelem defines two types of bus characteristics that can be specified by the designer: the data width (or number of conductors in the bus) and the data format (such as signed or unsigned). Kelem does not disclose or suggest the use of a bus that includes one or more data transfer protocol operations.

Similarly, claim 7 recites a parameter value that relates to data transfer protocol role of the component. An example of a data transfer protocol roles include a bus master role. (Specification p. 8). Kelem does not disclose or suggest the defining roles for circuit modules for communications between circuit modules.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6, 7 and dependent claim 8 are patentable over Kelem for at least this reason.

III. Rejection of Claims 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-15 as anticipated by Kelem. The Applicant has amended claim 9 to recite similar elements as claim 1, and respectfully submits that claim 9 and its dependent claims 10-15 are patentable over Kelem for reasons similar to those set forth above.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this Application are patentable and in condition for allowance and respectfully request an action to that end.

The Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned if he believes a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

5/9/05  
Date

  
Jonathan M. Hollander  
Reg. No. 48,717

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 415-576-0200  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
Attachments  
JMH:gsh  
60376796 v1